

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/056,916	01/25/2002	William Blyshak	8266-0744	3746	
75	7590 03/26/2004		EXAMINER		
Intellectual Pro	Intellectual Property Group			TRETTEL, MICHAEL	
Bose McKinney	& Evans LLP				
2700 First Indiana Plaza			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
135 North Pennsylvania Street			3673		
Indianapolis, IN	V 46204				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/056,916	BLYSHAK ET AL.		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Michael Trettel	3673		
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence add	dress	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	er: (1) a timely filed amendme appeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper rep nt which places the application	ation in	
PERIOD FO	OR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply of ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f).	expire later than SIX MONTHS from t	he mailing date of the final reject	tion.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pfee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. Set	eriod of extension and the correspon late of the shortened statutory period he Office later than three months afte	ding amount of the fee. The app for reply originally set in the final	oropriate extension I Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be ente	red because:			
(a)  they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N	Note below);			
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ation in better form for appeal l	by materially reducing or si	implifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected clain	ns.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>1-52,54</u> amendment canceling the non-allowable claim	<u>-80</u> would be allowable if subn m(s).	nitted in a separate, timely	filed	
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request application in condition for allowance because		en considered but does NC	OT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considere raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which we	re newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended claim			and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	lows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-52 and 62-80</u> .				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>54-61</u> .				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>53</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)		ved by the Examiner.		
Q  Note the attached Information Disclosure Sta	tement(s)( PTO-1449) Paner	No(s)		

Michael Trettel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3673

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed new limitation added to claim 53 stating that "the fluid system being external to the housing" is a new consideration and would have to be reconsidered in view of the prior art.